



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 25, 2003

Ms. Victoria Huynh
Assistant City Attorney
City of Plano
P.O. Box 860358
Plano, Texas 75086-0358

OR2003-8503

Dear Ms. Huynh:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 191639.

The City of Plano (the "city") received a request for "the contract awarded for EMS Billing service with contract number C-183-01." You inform us that the requestor "has been provided all documents relating to the contract with Southwest General Services of Dallas with the exception of 'Exhibit B.'" Although the city takes no position as to whether the requested information is excepted from public disclosure, you believe that the information submitted as Exhibit B may implicate the proprietary interests of a third party, Southwest General Services of Dallas ("Southwest General"). You inform this office and provide documentation showing that you have notified Southwest General of the request for information, and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released.¹ We have received correspondence from Southwest General, which we have considered along with the submitted information.

Initially, we note that Exhibit B is marked as "confidential and proprietary." However, information is not confidential under chapter 552 of the Government Code simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of chapter 552. *See* Attorney General Opinion

¹See Gov't Code § 552.305(d); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under Gov't Code ch. 552 in certain circumstances).

JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to chapter 552] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract.”), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Consequently, unless the information relating to Southwest General comes within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

We also note Southwest General’s argument under section 552.104 of the Government Code. Section 552.104 excepts information from disclosure if a governmental body demonstrates that the release of the information would cause potential specific harm to its interests in a particular competitive situation. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 593 at 2 (1991), 463 (1987), 453 at 3 (1986). Section 552.104 is not designed to protect the interests of private parties that submit information to a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8-9 (1991). We note that the city has not argued that the release of any portion of the submitted information would harm its interests in a particular competitive situation. Accordingly, we conclude that the city may not withhold any portion of Southwest General’s information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Next, Southwest General asserts that its billing and collection processes and computer software capabilities are excepted under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision,” and (2) “commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained.” *See* Gov’t Code § 552.110(a)-(b).

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a “trade secret” from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, which holds a “trade secret” to be

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one’s business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to a single or ephemeral event in the conduct of the business A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business [It may] relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958). If the governmental body takes no position on the application of the “trade secrets” component of section 552.110 to the information at issue, this office will accept a private party’s claim for exception as valid under that component if that party establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law.² *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) applies unless it has been shown that the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Southwest General contends that its billing and collection processes and computer software capabilities constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a). Having considered the submitted arguments, we conclude that Southwest General has demonstrated portions of the submitted information are trade secrets excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Southwest General has not demonstrated that all of Exhibit B meets the definition of trade secret. Therefore, the city must withhold only the marked information under section 552.110. The remaining information in Exhibit B must be released.³

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by

²The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company];
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and other involved in [the company’s] business;
- (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
- (4) the value of the information to [the company] and [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information;
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

³Because we find that section 552.110(a) of the Government Code makes portions of the submitted information confidential by law, we decline to address Southwest General’s claim under section 552.101 that trade secrets have been judicially deemed confidential.

filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Heather R. Rutland", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Heather R. Rutland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

HRR/sdk

Ref: ID# 191639

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Semret Tekleab
Americare Staffing Services
11520 North Central Expressway, Suite 116
Dallas, Texas 75243
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Angela K. Washington
Cowles & Thompson
901 Main Street, Suite 4000
Dallas, Texas 75202-3793
(w/o enclosures)